

MINUTES
of the
Mental Health Planning Advisory Council
meeting on
March 30, 2004
held at
Southwest USA bank
Conference Room
4043 S Eastern Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89119

I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTIONS

Judge Cooley, Chair of the Council, called the meeting to order at 11:25 am. She requested that everyone present introduce themselves and discuss the work of their respective agencies.

Members present:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| • Bennett, Bob | • Lovass-Nagy, Chris |
| • Cooley, Judge W. | • Parra, Debbie |
| • Jackson, Barbara | • Peterson, Christa (for Jerry Clark) |
| • Johnson, Rosetta | • Thomas, Alyce |
| • Kizer, Jennifer (for Kevin Crowe) | • Wherry, Mary |

Members absent:

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------|
| • Clark, Jerry | • Rodriguez, Jenita |
| • Crowe, Kevin | • Uptergrove, Anna |
| • Dopf, Gloria | |

Staff and others in attendance:

- | | |
|---|--|
| • McCoy, Angela – Janssen Pharmaceutica | • Scott, Tondalaya – MHA of Greater Nevada |
| • Pickney, Walter – Nevada Medicaid | • Zeiser, Andrew – Administrative Consultant |

Judge Cooley then discussed some of her goals for the Council during 2004. She would like to the Council members to provide an overview about the work of their agencies during the meetings throughout the year, in order to promote greater networking within the Council. She discussed the possibility of including speakers and trainings that might help promote the work of the Council. She also discussed seeking fundraising opportunities.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING: OCTOBER 16, 2003

Judge Cooley asked if there are any questions or comments on the minutes. None were made. In addition to the minutes from the meeting on October 16, 2003, minutes from the Policy Committee and Executive Committee meetings held on February 26, 2003, were also set forth for approval. Judge Cooley then asked for a motion to approve.

MOTION: Made by Mary Wherry, seconded by Alyce Thomas, to approve all sets of minutes set forth for approval.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

III. GUEST PRESENTATION: MHA OF GREATER NEVADA – TONDALAYA SCOTT

Judge Cooley began by reminding everyone that four subgrants were awarded in fiscal year (FY) 2004 for consumer services, and the Council wanted an opportunity to monitor the work of the subgrantees. Therefore, they will be invited to meetings as schedules allow in order to provide information to the members.

Alyce Thomas then introduced Tondalaya Scott from the Mental Health Association (MHA) of Greater Nevada. Tondalaya read a letter from Virginia Moten, Director of the MHA, which provides an update on the participant selection process for the Leadership Academy. This is the project funded through the subgrant.

Tondalaya also announced that a lifetime service award will be given to Rosetta Johnson at the Statewide Mental Health Consumer Conference scheduled in May, 2004. Alyce explained that she hopes this will be done annually to honor people who have worked in mental health.

Judge Cooley reminded everyone that the purpose of hearing the presentation is to ensure that the goals of the subgrant program are being met, and then asked for questions from the group. Mary Wherry asked about the number of applicants. Tondalaya said the total number is currently 23: 10 from the south, six from the southern rurals, five from Reno, and two from northern rurals.

Mary asked about the cultural and ethnic diversity of the applicants. Alyce said two are from Native American populations, and she also commented on the fact that applicants represent consumers with different types of mental disorders, including adults with dual diagnosis. Alyce also reviewed the various organizations through which applications are being promoted. More discussion followed about the logistics of the training and travel.

Mary then asked about participant selection criteria. Alyce said there are seven people on the selection committee, including consumers and previous Leadership Academy graduates. Mary asked additional questions about how participants will be selected.

Chris Lovass-Nagy asked about the number of consumers who will be served. Twenty was projected in the subgrant application, but they may be able to include up to 40 based on additional funding for the training. Judge Cooley asked when the training is scheduled. Tondalaya said that a “train the trainers” session will occur prior to the full training event, which will be held May 3 through 5, 2004.

Bob Bennett asked for copies of the applications. Tondalaya agreed to distribute them to whomever is interested.

IV. FY 2004 MHPAC BUDGET REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Judge Cooley asked Andrew Zeiser to begin his review of the budget documents. Andrew first provided an overview of the FY 2003 expenditure report, noting in particular line items where funds were not expended, yielding a remainder for the year of approximately \$5,700. He also discussed the varying travel expenses, pointing out that these are the line items with the greatest fluctuation from year to year. He explained that the Council needs to consider options for expending the \$5,700 remainder from FY 2003, and should also consider leaving a small amount as a prudent reserve to ensure that the budget is not overspent due to any unreconciled expenditures.

Andrew moved on to review the FY 2004 proposed budget and budget detail. In particular, he explained that the line item for the joint meeting with the MHDS Commission was subtracted out because the Council is past the time frame during which the meeting would have normally been scheduled. Additionally, he explained that the line item for the annual MHPAC reception, in the amount of \$2,400, would have to be reallocated to another line item because Jennifer Kizer has directed that expenditures can no longer be made for catering or entertainment expenses based on State restrictions. He also reviewed the summary of staff changes at the end of the FY 2004 proposed budget document, explaining the net cost and savings from the recent Council staff changes. Finally, he reviewed some of the information in the budget detail, explaining amounts costed for administrative support and fiscal support, along with travel projections that ensure money is available for out-of-state conferences.

Judge Cooley asked if the approximate \$5,700 remainder must be expended by end of the fiscal year. Jennifer explained that she is trying to match the State fiscal year (SFY) to the federal fiscal year (FFY), and that her goal is for remaining grant funds from MHDS, DCFS, and

MHPAC to go into a “common pot,” from which decisions would be made collectively on how to expend these funds. This would also enable her to implement a shift from FFY to SFY accounting, which would make grant budgeting and accounting easier in the long run.

Mary Wherry asked what the federal rules are for unexpended grant funds. Jennifer said that they revert. Mary asked if it is possible to still expend the \$5,700 remainder, or did it revert at the end of September, 2003. Jennifer said the grant is on a two-year cycle, so the Council has until September 30, 2004, to expend the remainder.

Judge Cooley asked who would make decisions about the “common pot” of unexpended funds and if the Council would retain control over its portion. Jennifer explained that funds which are most commonly leftover come from salary savings for staff positions. More discussion followed. Judge Cooley then explained that she is trying to understand whether the Council’s unexpended funds, for example the \$5,700 from FY 2003, would remain under the direction of the Council. Jennifer said that all remaining funds, including from MHDS and DCFS, would be included for advisement by the Council.

Alyce Thomas said she thinks it is a good idea to allow the Council to weigh in on possible grant reversion expenditures. However, she wants to confirm that the \$5,700 is still available currently for the Council to make a determination about. Jennifer and Andrew agreed that it is.

Mary asked about the restrictions on the use of federal funds. Rosetta Johnson reminded everyone of the three federally mandated duties of MHPACs. Mary said she thinks it is important for the Council to understand the budget timeline and process for State agency budgets. She believes it is important to know at what point the Council can advocate for funding when Division budgets are proposed for the next biennial funding cycle.

Rosetta said she would like the Council to have input into the agency budgets, but she reminded everyone that ultimately the budgets are under the purview of the Division Administrators.

Mary asked if a lobbyist could be hired. Several Council members answered no. Andrew agreed and pointed out that this is a specific restriction in the block grant agreements. Judge Cooley asked Jennifer to provide information about what are allowable expenditures and what are not. Discussion followed about budget details. Rosetta suggested that the Council collaborate with other consumer organizations and advocacy groups to help achieve some of its goals in terms of Legislative advocacy. Mary agreed that collaboration with other groups might help achieve the same ends as a lobbyist.

Andrew then reminded everyone that the \$5,700 is up for discussion and approval on today’s agenda, along with approval of the FY 2004 budget. Judge Cooley brought up a request she received from the Division of Mental Health and Developmental Services (MHDS) for \$2,000 to purchase service awareness materials for distribution to consumers, including pens, awards, hats, etc. Alyce explained how some of these materials would be given to consumers.

Rosetta said she is against money going to administration, and she believes that funds need to be distributed in the rural areas, where there is a tremendous amount of need. One of the critical

needs she sees is the intensive transportation requirements for consumers to get to appointments. She believes more money needs to be concentrated on meeting the needs of consumers. Mary said that she is concerned about attention being placed on consumer representation during the Legislative sessions. She believes money should be allocated to train consumers to effectively advocate at the Legislature. Alyce said she believes programs such as the Leadership Academy help promote consumer advocacy. More discussion followed.

Angela McCoy said that the National Mental Health Association (NMHA) provides training to consumers on lobbying techniques. Alyce indicated that she is a certified trainer for this through NMHA, and this training will be included in Leadership Academy training provided by the MHA of Greater Nevada. Barbara Jackson said that the League of Women Voters also provides training in this area. Judge Cooley asked Barbara if she would contact them to see if they can provide a presentation or training to the Council. More discussion followed.

Judge Cooley then made a motion to allocate \$2,000 of the \$5,700 to MHDS for consumer awareness materials.

MOTION: Made by Judge Cooley, seconded by Alyce Thomas, to allocate \$2,000 to MHDS for consumer awareness materials. Mary Wherry asked for an amendment to allocate a portion of the funds to the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) for the same purpose. Alyce Thomas asked that it be noted that she has attempted to contact the new DCFS Administrator numerous times with no success. Judge Cooley rejected the amendment, saying that she wants to support MHDS since they approached her directly, noting that there is currently no communication between the new DCFS Administrator and the Council. Christa Peterson said she will explain the Council's desire to open up communication with DCFS and the new Administrator.

Judge Cooley asked for further discussion on the motion and no comments were made. She then called for a vote.

IN FAVOR: Judge Cooley, Barbara Jackson, Jennifer Kizer (for Kevin Crowe), Alyce Thomas, Chris Lovass-Nagy, Debbie Parra.

ABSTAINED: Bob Bennett, Rosetta Johnson, Christa Peterson (for Jerry Clark), and Mary Wherry.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

Judge Cooley then reminded everyone of two things: 1) \$3,700 still remains from FY 2003 for an expenditure decision; 2) \$2,400 needs to be reallocated within the FY 2004 budget from the annual reception line item, along with acceptance of the proposed budget. Andrew recommended that the Council consider moving the \$2,400 to the consumer services subgrants. Alyce Thomas then made a motion accordingly.

MOTION: Made by Alyce Thomas, seconded by Judge Cooley, to accept the FY 2004 proposed budget, and to move \$2,400 from the line item for the MHPAC reception into the line item for consumer education and training subgrants.

Judge Cooley asked for further discussion on the motion and no comments were made. She then called for a vote.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

Judge Cooley then called for the scheduled lunch break, indicating that the Council will still need to make a decision about the \$3,700 remainder from the FY 2003 budget.

**** The meeting broke for lunch at 12:45 pm, then resumed at 2:00 pm.*

Judge Cooley resumed the meeting by asking if there are any suggestions for the remaining \$3,700. Alyce suggested holding \$1,500 in reserve for unforeseen expenses. Judge Cooley suggested \$1,700. This would leave \$2,000 available for additional allocations.

Alyce brought up the need for additional support of the Statewide Mental Health Consumer Conference in May, 2004. Judge Cooley asked what amount Alyce would like from the Council. Alyce said she would accept whatever amount the Council might be willing to give.

Bob stated that he agrees with Rosetta's suggestion to provide an allocation for transportation expenses in the rural areas. Judge Cooley said she agrees with the premise, but does not know how it will be distributed and implemented. Judge Cooley suggested that Rosetta might convene a committee to explore how the money would be expended.

Rosetta said that a mechanism is already in place through the subgrant process, and asked Andrew if this could be done similarly to the subgrant awarded to Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS) for the Canteen. Andrew agreed that this could be done. Alyce suggested confirming this with Jennifer. Jennifer agreed.

Mary confirmed the amount available is \$3,700. Judge Cooley explained again that she would like to retain \$1,700 for unforeseen expenses, leaving \$2,000 for reallocation. Alyce then suggested allocating \$1,000 for each purpose recommended.

Chris suggested that \$1,000 is too low for travel expenses in the rurals, and she suggested allocating the \$1,000 for Rosetta's upcoming conference instead. Jennifer pointed out that the conference is in November, which past the fiscal year deadline of September 30.

Mary then made a motion based on Alyce's recommendation.

MOTION: Made by Mary Wherry, seconded by Debbie Parra, to allocate \$1,000 for rural travel expenses to be managed through Rural Clinics, and \$1,000 for the Statewide Mental Health Consumer Conference for printing and/or other allowable expenses.

Judge Cooley asked for further discussion on the motion and no comments were made. She then called for a vote.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

ABSTAINED: Alyce Thomas.

V. MHPAC MEMBERSHIP UPDATE – JUDGE COOLEY AND ROBERT BENNETT

Judge Cooley reviewed the definitions of consumer and family member proposed by the Policy Committee and asked for comments. Barbara Jackson asked if someone received services in another State, but not Nevada, does that mean they would be ineligible for membership? Various comments were made. Judge Cooley suggested that the phrase “in the state of Nevada” could be deleted to allow for consumers from outside the State system. Alyce Thomas explained that this might allow for people with no knowledge to the Nevada system to sit on the Council and make policy decisions. Judge Cooley reminded everyone that the Council would still make individual decisions and recommendations about members, and would be able to consider these issues.

Christa Peterson pointed out that some families of children with serious emotional disturbance (SED) have kids who require out-of-state placement to receive appropriate services, and therefore may not have kids in the state system but still be stakeholders in the process. More discussion followed.

Judge Cooley again recommended removing “in the State of Nevada” from the definitions, which would allow for the Council to consider potential members’ backgrounds on an individual basis. Mary Wherry then made a motion accordingly.

MOTION: Made by Mary Wherry, seconded by Debbie Parra, to remove “in the State of Nevada” from all three bullet points in the proposed definitions and approve the remaining text as submitted.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

OPPOSED: Alyce Thomas.

Judge Cooley then reminded everyone about the current Council vacancies, which include four positions as follows:

1. Family member of adult with SMI
2. Family member of child with SED
3. Consumer
4. Consumer

She explained that appointments are in process with the Department of Corrections (DOC) and Vocational Rehabilitation for the vacancies in the Criminal Justice and Vocational Rehabilitation categories.

Judge Cooley asked the Nominating Committee members present today to identify themselves. Barbara Jackson, Rosetta Johnson, and Alyce Thomas identified themselves as members. Andrew Zeiser explained that Jenita Rodriguez and Anna Uptergrove are not present today, but are on the Committee also. Judge Cooley said she would like to invite new recommended members to the June meeting and then vote on their recommendations. She requested that the Nominating Committee members schedule a teleconference to review the current membership applications, set a cut off date for the receipt of additional applications for this nomination cycle, and agree on nominations.

Judge Cooley asked if the Nominating Committee members agree with this process. The members agreed. She reminded the members that they have to schedule their teleconference through Andrew so he can develop an agenda and complete a public notice for the meeting.

Rosetta Johnson said she would like Barbara Jackson to Chair the Nominating Committee. Judge Cooley asked that the Committee members name the Chair amongst themselves when they have the teleconference.

VI. REVIEW AND DISCUSS QUARTERLY REPORTS FROM SUBGRANT RECIPIENTS

Judge Cooley asked for feedback on the quarterly reports included in the meeting packets. Andrew Zeiser briefly explained the misunderstanding with RESTART, which he believes led to a blank report being submitted.

Judge Cooley bypassed discussion on the RESTART report because it is blank. She also noted that because the MHA of Greater Nevada made a presentation this morning, she will not ask for discussion on this report either.

She moved on to the Nevada Health Centers report and asked for comments. Chris Lovass-Nagy asked for total grant award amounts. Andrew said he does not have this information available for today's meeting. She said this is important in order to understand whether there are unexpended funds. Alyce Thomas and Chris suggested adding information about the total grant awarded to the quarterly report format. Andrew agreed.

Walter Pickney asked several questions about outcomes and program impact. Judge Cooley recommended saving these questions for when staff from Nevada Health Centers makes a presentation at a future meeting. She requested also that members submit the questions in advance so that staff can come prepared with answers.

Judge Cooley then moved on to the HealthSmart report. Alyce Thomas requested that the Council see the program brochures discussed in the report. Judge Cooley asked that printed materials be requested with the next quarterly reports. Andrew agreed.

Jennifer Kizer asked if the current subgrants end June 30. Andrew said yes. Jennifer asked if questions about the subgrants should be forwarded to Andrew. Judge Cooley said yes, and reminded everyone that this process is developmental and that timelines may need to be changed. Questions followed about adjusting quarterly report time frames and requirements.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Judge Cooley asked Andrew to explain the Title IV-B invitation to the Council. Andrew explained that DCFS is in the process of developing a five-year plan as part of the federal requirements for Title IV-B funding. The current five-year plan ends this year, so the plan for the next five-year cycle is due in July, 2004. He said that 10 workgroups will be convened that include DCFS staff and outside stakeholders, each focused on a specific area of review in order to make recommendations for the plan. The Council has been invited to recommend a stakeholder to participate in a statewide planning meeting being held in Las Vegas on April 21 and 22.

Judge Cooley asked for volunteers to participate in this planning meeting. Alyce Thomas volunteered. Walter Pickney said he will also be attending. Judge Cooley asked him to please keep the interests of mental health consumers and the Council in mind as part of his representation at the meeting.

Alyce then brought up the letter from the Council to Carlos Brandenburg about the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) staff placement at MHDS. Andrew explained that it is standard for the Council to provide a letter of support for programs such as this when they are requested, and said that MHDS would be using the staff person provided by CDC to develop a statewide suicide prevention plan. Alyce indicated her support for this program. Brief discussion followed.

Bob Bennett then asked Alyce about the Consumer Assistance Program (CAP) staff training development. Judge Cooley asked them to discuss this matter after the meeting.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public attendees made their comments under the agenda items above.

IX. SET DATE, TIME, LOCATION, AND TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

Judge Cooley said that she is not prepared to set meeting dates for the year during today's meeting, but will notify the Council members about a June meeting date at a later time.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 pm.